

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In response to the Office Action, Applicants cancel claims 8 and 10-12 to advance prosecution and amend claim 17 to more clearly define the invention. Remarks below apply to all claims.

Sasaki teaches generating a pull-down menu in a graphical user interface as the Examiner asserts. However, Sasaki does not allow a user to specify preferences as taught and claimed by the present invention. Instead, Sasaki sorts a list of cameras to be controlled “in accordance with the degrees of frequency of use thereof so that the camera names are displayed in a list in order of decreasing frequency of use.” (abstract, column 9 line 65 to column 10 line 15) Alternately, Sasaki can sort the list of cameras “in order of decreasing time over which the cameras have been selected for control” (column 10 lines 38-40) or “the number of times a camera control command is issued may be counted and the pull-down menu 130 may be displayed in order of decreasing count value” (column 10 lines 42-45).

Kaplan is invalid prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Kaplan and the present patent application were, at the time the invention described in the present patent application was made, owned by IBM Corporation. Kaplan is thus disqualified as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the rejection is overcome. See MPEP 706.02(l)(2).

Mankoff teaches a system and method of managing virtual documents, such as virtual coupons that may be used for online ordering. A user may employ a pull-down list to select a vendor for online shopping, according to the section of Mankoff cited by the Examiner. However, Mankoff fails to remedy the shortcomings of Sasaki cited above, e.g. Mankoff also fails to allow a user to specify preferences as taught and claimed by the present invention.

In contrast, the present invention allows a user to specify preferences regarding available user choices describing electronic commerce transactions by moving labeled items in a pull-down menu, so that relative item positions correspond to relative user preferences. Neither Sasaki nor Mankoff allow a user to directly specify preferences by moving labeled items in a pull-down menu. Thus, as not all elements of the present invention are taught or suggested by the cited prior art, the obviousness rejections are overcome.

Regarding dependent claim 2 specifically, Sasaki teaches the automatic determination of whether power is being supplied to a particular camera. Sasaki then responsively does not display pull-down menu items corresponding to such unpowered cameras, or displays them "such that the user can distinguish the camera from one whose power supply is ON." (Column 12 lines 44-46). However, Sasaki fails to teach enabling a user to delete items representing unacceptable user choices, as taught and claimed by the present invention (page 4 lines 4 and 9, page 6 lines 20-21). Applicants amended claim 2 to clarify this point.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3-5 and 9. The Start Bar in the Windows (R) family of operating systems is well known in the art, but is not related to arranging items in pull-down menus to specify user preferences regarding electronic commerce transactions as stated in the as-amended claims. Thus, the combination of Sasaki and Windows NT fail to each or suggest the present invention, either separately or in combination.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Shanmugasundaram Ravikumar et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364